

Case IPR2016-00820
U.S. Patent No. 7,064,197

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HOLOGIC, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

ENZO LIFE SCIENCES, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-00820

U.S. Patent No. 7,064,197
TITLE: SYSTEM, ARRAY AND NON-POROUS SOLID SUPPORT
COMPRISING FIXED OR IMMOBILIZED NUCLEIC ACIDS
Issue Date: June 20, 2006

DECLARATION OF GREGORY BUCK, Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	5
II. BASES FOR OPINIONS	6
III. MATERIALS REVIEWED	6
IV. EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE.....	7
V. LEGAL STANDARDS	12
A. Anticipation	13
B. Obviousness.....	14
C. Obvious To Try	17
D. Invention Date	18
VI. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	19
VII. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND	20
VIII. OPINIONS.....	24
A. Fish Does Not Anticipate Any Of Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 27, 32, 33, 34, 41, 61, 62, 63, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 79, 100, 191, 193, 194, 212, 213, 219, 222, 225, 226, 227, 230, 233, Or 236.....	24
1. Fish Does Not Involve Nucleic Acid Hybridization Detection Technology.....	24
2. Fish Does Not Disclose Single-Stranded Nucleic Acid Strands Fixed Or Immobilized To A Non-Porous Solid Support.....	25
3. Fish Does Not Disclose Single-Stranded Nucleic Acids Fixed Or Immobilized To A Non-Porous Solid Support In Hybridizable Form.....	42

i.	Fish Does Not Unavoidably Teach Single-Stranded Nucleic Acids That Are Capable of Hybridization.	43
ii.	The Hybridization Described In Diehl Is Not Applicable To Fish.	50
iii.	The '197 Patent Prosecution History Does Not Support Petitioner's Inherency Theory.	59
E.	Fish, Standing Alone, Does Not Render Obvious Any Of Claims 31, 64, 68, 101, 192, Or 195.	63
1.	Fish Does Not Teach Or Suggest A Fixed Or Immobilized Nucleic Acid That Comprises A Nucleic Acid Sequence Complementary To A Nucleic Acid Sequence of Interest Sought To Be Identified, Quantified Or Sequenced.	63
2.	Fish Does Not Disclose Fixed Or Immobilized RNA.	67
F.	Fish In View Of Gilham Does Not Render Obvious Any Of Claims 38, 78, Or 218.	69
G.	VPK Is Not Prior Art.	74
1.	The '197 Patent Provides Written Description For The Genus Of "Non-Porous Solid Supports."	74
2.	Enzo's Inventors Reduced the Challenged Claims to Practice Before VPK's Effective Date Of October 1982.	80
H.	VPK Does Not Anticipate Any Of Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 27, 31, 32, 34, 61, 62, 63, 68, 69, 70, 72, 74, 79, 100, 191, 192, 193, 194, 213, 219, 226, 227, Or 236.	116
1.	Independent Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, And 27	118
2.	Dependent Claims 31, 68, And 192	126
3.	Dependent Claims 79, 219, And 236	130

4.	Dependent Claims 32, 34, 61, 62, 63, 69, 70, 72, 74, 100, 191, 193, 194, 213, 226, And 227.....	131
I.	Noyes In View Of VPK And Ramachandran Does Not Render Obvious Any Of Claims 16, 38, 64, 78, 101, 195, 218, 222, Or 230.	131
J.	VPK In View Of Metzgar Does Not Render Obvious Any Of Claims 33, 41, 73, 212, 225, Or 233.	142
K.	Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness.....	146

I. INTRODUCTION

I, **Gregory Buck, Ph.D.**, a resident of Richmond, Virginia over 18 years of age, hereby declare as follows:

1. I have personal knowledge of all of the matters about which I testify in this declaration.

2. Desmarais LLP retained me on behalf of Enzo Life Sciences, Inc. (“Enzo”) to provide my technical opinions and testimony about claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 41, 61, 62, 63, 64, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 78, 79, 100, 101, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 212, 213, 218, 219, 222, 225, 226, 227, 230, 233, and 236 of U.S. Patent No. 7,064,197 (Ex. 1001, “the ’197 Patent”). I refer to those claims as the “challenged claims.”

3. I am being compensated for my work in this proceeding and receiving reimbursement for expenses incurred in the course of my work. My compensation is not contingent in any way on either the opinions I have reached or the outcome of this case.

4. I was also retained on behalf of Enzo to provide technical opinions and testimony on infringement and validity issues regarding the ’197 Patent in certain district court cases. I have provided an expert report and/or expert testimony in the following matters: *Enzo Life Sciences, Inc. v. Agilent Technologies Inc.*, Civil Action No. 1:12-cv-434 (D. Del.); *Enzo Life Sciences, Inc.*

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.